(SRI P. M. NADGOUDA)

ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಕಾಯುವೆಯಿಂದ 55 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ರೈತರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಲು ವಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಬೇಸಾಯಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಖರೆ ಇದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೆ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಾರದು. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ 55 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೂಪರ್‌ಸೀಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri S. C. KUBSAD.—What are the reasons for the delay in disbursement of loans to the farmers and is it not a fact that the Apex Bank could not release the funds to the K.C.C. Bank for want of disbursement statement ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಎಂ. ನಾಡಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರೈತರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲ ನಾನ್ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್‌ಚರಲ್ ಪರ್ಪಸ್‌ಗೆ ಒಂದೂವರೆ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಿಸೋರ್ಸಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಅಬ್‌ನಾರ್ಮಲ್ ಪ್ರನಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟು ತಡೆಯಾಗಲಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Sri V. S. HIRE GOUDER.—Is not depriving the farmers of their supply of manure a grave lapse ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಎಂ. ನಾಡಗೌಡ.—ಡಿಪ್ರೈವ್ ಮಾಡಲಲ್ಲ. ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 21 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಕ್ಯಾಷ್ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಬಿ. ಕಾಂಪೊನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಮೂರು ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೋಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯವರು ಕೆ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿಗೆ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಪೆಕ್ಸ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನವರು ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಅಡ್ವೆಸ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN —Question Hour is Over.

Notice of Adjournment Motion *re* : Police Excesses at the Bangalore University Students

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ವಿಧಾನಸಭಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಶನ್ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಮೇರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮಿತಿಮೀರಿ ಲಾಠಿಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾಲೇಜು ಹಾಸ್ಟೆಲಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ನುಗ್ಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ಸಿಕ್ಕಾಪಟ್ಟೆ ಹೊಡಗರಿಗೆ ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಗಹನವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವು ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The Chair is examining the question. I have not applied my mind to find out whether under the Rules the motion is admissible or not. Apart from that I understand that at the request of the University authorities, police had to intervene for the protection of the University properties. When the police entered the premises, there was some trouble and so under the provisions of the relevant Act action has been taken. It is also learnt that an order under Section 144 has been promulgated. It must be remembered that this is a matter which is not directly and primarily the concern of the State

Government. This is a law and order question and on this point there are several rulings. However, the Chair is examining the question to find out whether the motion satisfies the conditions in rule 49. Of course, hon. Members will be given opportunity to show how the Government are directly responsible for the situation. Let us consider it dispassionately. I will also have to consult the Hon. Education Minister who is also the Leader of the House. He is not here at the moment. If any of the Hon. Ministers peresent here were to say something on behalf of the Hon. Eduction Minister, then it can be considered.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ತಾವು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಪೋಲೀಸರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಪಾಲನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೂಡ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲೆ ಮೀರಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹುಡುಗರ ಹಾಸ್ಟಲಿಗೆ ನುಗ್ಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೇರವಾದ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇದೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಎಲ್ಲೆ ಮೀರಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಶನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಪವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಣೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ರೀರಿ. ಇವತ್ತು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ವಾತಾವರಣ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ ಅಂದರೆ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಿಕ್ಕಾಪಟ್ಟೆ ದನಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯವರ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯ ಮೇರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಸರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಲು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು, ಬೇರೇನೂ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಹಾಸ್ಟೆಲಿನ 231-232 ರೂಮ್ ಬಾಗಿಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. 2-3 ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಏಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು 20 ಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಊಟ ಕೊಡವೆ, ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಯಾವ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಮೇರೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ಮುಖಂಡನನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಪೋಲೀಸರ ದಬ್ಬಾಳಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಂತ ವಿಚಾರ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಸಿಕ್ಕಾಪಟ್ಟೆ ಹೊಡೆದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎರಡೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಏನು ಒಂದು ಅಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು ಅದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಒಪ್ಪಲಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಅತಿರೇಕಕ್ಕೂ ಹೋಗದಂತೆ ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬೇಕು. ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅನಾಹುತ ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಕಣ್ಣುಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಾವು ಶಾಸಕರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಚಿಕೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಈ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಬೃಹದಾಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 2½ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎನ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚಿನ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಚಳುವಳಿಯು ಬಹಳ ಉಗ್ರರೂಪವನ್ನು ತಾಳುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಾಣಹಾನಿಯನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ ನೆರವು ಪಡೆದದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬೆಂಚು, ಕುರ್ಚಿಗಳು, ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ವಗೈರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಂದ ಹಾನಿಯುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಆವರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರನ್ನು ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಹಾಸ್ಟಲಿನ ಆವರಣಕ್ಕೆ ರಾತ್ರಿ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತು ಆ ಹಾಸ್ಟಲ್ಲಿನಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಭಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಹಾಸ್ಟಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ನುಗ್ಗಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದು ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕೋಪಗೊಂಡು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಹಳ ವಿಕೋಪಕ್ಕೆಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಕಾಲೇಜು ಹಾಸ್ಟಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಏನು ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲವು ಶಾಸಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಎಂ.ಪಿ. ಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಯಾನಕವಾದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎತ್ತೂರೆರೆ ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಗಹನವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಅಂಥೋಲನವನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಂತಹ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. This is a matter relating to the administration of law. I think I will have to consult even the Hon. Minister for Law. There are ever so many Rulings on this question. ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೀವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತಹ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ:

> "On 18th November, 1955, Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy sought to move an adjournment of the House to discuss the situation arising out of the merciless and highhanded beatings of the Police on 8,000 persons going in a peaceful procession on 16th October 1955 to protest against the fromation of United Karnatak and for the preservation of Mysore's political entity. The Speaker, ruling the motion out of order, observed :—
>
> "Matters relating to ordinary administration of law cannot form the subject of an adjournment motion so as to supersede the appointed order of business. Further, the incident is alleged to have taken place on the 16th October 1955."

ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮೋಷನ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೇಗೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ನಾನು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನೂ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಯಾವ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೂ ಬೈಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಮಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎನ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಹೆಣ್ಣುಮಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಆಕೆಯು ಪ್ರಾಣ ಹೋಯಿತು. ಈ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಕೆಳಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂಟೆಗಟ್ಟಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಕೆಯು ಹೆಸರು ಮುನಿಯಮ್ಮ ಎಂದು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕೆಳಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥಾ ಅನೇಕ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ 144ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಾಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೇ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

4-00 P. M.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—I would like to quote another ruling given in the Parliament in this behalf on 28-8-1959. The Ruling says :

> "Matters relating to the day-to-day administration of autonomous organisations, Corporations, etc., cannot be raised by way of on adjournment motion."

But, anyway, I am trying to ascertain the views of hon. Members on both the sides, so as to come to certain conclusion and give my decision. Hence, I would like to know from the Government side, their views in the matter.

† Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare).—Sir, I am sorry I cannot deputise on behalf of the Leader of the House or at this stage, can I say something on the merits of the adjournment motion. It is an elementary principle that before an adjournment motion is admitted the version of the other side also should be heard. Now, neither the Hon. Chief Minister, who is in charge of the Home Portfolio, nor the Education Minister, who is in charge of the University affairs, is here. Both of them are engaged in the Lower House where a similar subject is being discussed.

In their absence here it may not be correct, without even ascertaining their views, to say anything in the matter. Of course, I am not disputing what the hon. Members say ; I do not cast aspersions on any hon. Member in regard to the veracity of the statements ; but nevertheless, it is necessary to ascertain from the other side whether such things have happened and then only discussion can take place. But now when both the Leader of this House and the hon. Chief Minister are not in this House and without ascertaining their views in the matter, it may not be correct to take up this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The House will now rise for Tea and meet again at 4-30 P.M.

The House rose for Tea at Five Minutes past Four of the clock and re-assembled on Thirty Minutes past Four of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR]

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—Sir, I would like to make a submission that instead of the first item mentioned in the Agenda after Question Hour, the House may take up the motion relating to the Bangalore University.

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—Before that I would like to suggest that there is an adjournment motion given notice of on a similar subject, which may be taken up.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Since the hon. Chief Minister is here, I would like to know from him, whether he would like to say anything in the matter.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—With your permission, I would like to make the following statement :

As the House is already aware, on 14th August 1969 Sri H. D. Gangaraj, student of the Dayananda Evening College and President of the Bangalore University Students Council met the Chief Minister and presented a memorandum containing three demands. The Chief Minister promised to get these demands examined and to intimate the stand of the Government on these demands by the end of the month.

The three demands were :

(1) that a judicial probe should be ordered to look into allegation of communalism and favouritism in the University affairs ;

(2) that representation should be given to students' representatives on the Syndicate, the Academic Council and the Senate of the University ; and

(3) that a scheme for revaluation of answer scripts should be sanctioned.

After getting the matter examined, Government informed Sri H. D. Gangaraj on 1st September 1969 that there was no *prima facie* case for a judicial probe, but if the students Council were to produce material to substantiate the allegations, the matter could be considered further. In regard to the other two demands also, an assurance was held out that the matter would be considered on merits in consultation with the University Grants Commission and the Vice-Chancellors of other Universities in the State. In the circumstances, Shri Gangaraj was requested to use his good offices to ensure that the energies of our students are concentrated on their studies, instead of being frittered away on wasteful demonstrations.

It is unfortunate that in spite of this appeal, Sri Gangaraj issued a call for an idenfinite strike from 2nd September 1969. However, another group known by the name of Bangalore University students Vigilance Committee, headed by one Sri K. S. Umapathy, a student of Renukacharya Law College, issued a pamphlet opposing the move and appealing

to the students not to be misguided by the strike call given by Sri Gangaraj.

In response to the call given by Sri Gangaraj and Sri H. T. Ramesh, President and Vice-President respectively of the Students Council, students from some Colleges abstained from classes on 2nd September 1969. That afternoon about 1500 students gathered in front of the University Office and the road between the Government Arts and Science College and the University Office was more or less blocked. Sri Gangaraj and others spoke. Sri Gangaraj also mentioned about his determention to commence an indefinite hunger strike from 5th September 1969.

On 3rd September 1969, most of the Colleges commenced working normally. But about 10-45 A. M. Sri H. D. Gangaraj and a few others went round in car to various Colleges and exhorted the students to come out of the classes. As a result, some of the Colleges had to suspend the classes.

On 4th September 1969 at about 11-30 A.M. students collected on the road between Mysore Bank Square and K. R. Circle and started indulging in worrying the persons moving on the road. As a result, vehicular traffic had to be diverted. At about 1-30 P.M. about 4000 students gathered in front of the University Office, freely indulged in shouting slogans directed against the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar in particular. Two of the students asked the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar to address them on the spot. They burnt the effigy of the Registrar, broke the flower pots and a few glass panes of the University Office. At about 3-15 P.M. when the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar were proceeding from their Office, their car was stopped by the students and surrounded. Sri Gangaraj demanded that the Vice-Chancellor should reply to his questions immediately. The Vice-Chancellor advised Sri Gangaraj and other student leaders to meet him in his Office and discuss the problems as that was the proper forum. Still, for half-an-hour they were not allowed to proceed. The gherao was lifted after about half-an-hour.

On 5th September 1969 Sri Gangaraj commenced his fast at 1-00 P.M. and that afternoon at a Press Conference held by Sri Nanjiah, a student leader, at the instance of Sri Gangaraj, it was announced that the strike by students would be suspended with effect from 6th September 1969, but the hunger strike would continue till the demands are conceded. The Syndicate of the Bangalore University held an emergency meeting on 5th September 1969 and constituted a committee consisting of Sri Y. Ramachandra (Chairman), Sri Ganji Veerappa, Sri G. Sambashivaiah, Sri L. S. Venkaji Rao and Dr. H. L. Thimme Gowda to contact the leaders of different student groups, ascertain their grievances and submit a report to the University. The members of this Committee held diologue with the student leaders and submitted their report to the University Syndicate. It is understood that the principal demands urged on behalf of the student leaders were :

(i) institution of a Judicial enquiry, and

(SRI VEERENDRA PATIL)

(ii) the immediate withdrawal of Sri P. Mallikarjunappa, Registrar of the University.

This was considered by the University Syndicate at its emergency meeting held on 8th September 1969 and the Syndicate resolved that while they are willing to enquire into any specific allegations against the Registrar, they could not, without enquiry, compel him to leave the service of the University. The Syndicate also resolved that they would be quite prepared to co-operate with any enquiry that may be ordered by Government in regard to the allegations of communalism and mal-administration.

In the meanwhile, several Principals of the City Colleges and the Vice-Chancellor contacted the student leaders and sought to prevail upon them to see that the indefinite hunger strike of Sri H. D. Gangaraj is called off. These appeals did not prove effective.

A delegation of students met the Minister for Education at about 10 P.M. on the night of 8th September 1969 and he assured them that the allegations against the University would be referred to the University Grants Commission. The delegation wanted him to make this known directly to the students and he agreed to do so on the next day.

The taxis with loud speakers were continuously moving around the University office making the students to come to the University Campus to hear him at 12 noon on 9th September 1969. At about 11-45 A.M. about 5000 students began to pelt stones on the University office and broke the glass panes. Some of the students met the Minister in his office and he accompanied them to the University campus. Even when he was entering the campus, stones were hurled at his car and the wind-shield of the car was broken. There was continuous booing and shouting of slogans. With great difficulty the Minister managed to reach the place in the campus where Sri Gangaraj was fasting. After his arrival, Sri Gangaraj addressed the students and reitered his principal demands for a judicial enquiry and removal of the Registrar. He also appealed to the students to give him a patient hearing.

Thereafter the Minister addressed the students for about 5 minutes. I informed them that Government would be quite willing to submit the enquiry to the University Grant Commission and he appealed to them to give up their agitation and resume attending their classes. His words did not have much effect on the audience, and with some difficulty he managed to leave the campus in the car brought by the students, since the tyres of his car had been deflated.

About 1-20 P.M. a false fire alarm was communicated to the Fire Brigade and when two fire engines were arriving, stones were pelted on them on Palace Road. Stones were also pelted on passing vehicles on the road and the traffic was diverted from the Palace Road. At 2 P.M. smoke and fire was observed coming from inside the Senate Hall of the

University. The Vice-Chancellor contacted the control room for immediate police assistance inside the Campus. There was also a message from the Vice-Chancellor to the Deputy Commissioner of Police that some students had entered the office of the Assistant Registrar and had torn the registers, damaged furniture and were about to destroy records. The police therefore had to enter the Campus. There was heavy stone throwing on the police vehicles and other vehicles in front of the main gate of the University. In spite of repeated warnings to the students to disperse from the scene, not to resort to stone throwing and not to destroy public property, stones continued to be showered on the police. Four tear-gas shells were fired. The students had set fire to the main gate of the University. An attempt had been made to set fire to the Senate Hall. The carpet inside the Senate Hall was burning and was put out. One table, a chair and the almirah in the Office of the Special Officer caught fire and was put out. The iron gate was broken and the students had entered and ransacked the record room. At this stage, the police were obliged to dispers the crowd by a mild lathi charge. At about 3·40 P. M. the pandal constructed in the District Office compound in connection with the celebration of a function to honour the Jain Swamiji Acharya Tulsi had also been set fire to. The Fire Brigade put out the fire. Even at this stage, there was heavy stone throwing from the College Hostel. When the agitators were chased, a large number of them got on to the terrace of the hostel and continued throwing stones, brick-bats, pieces of furniture and iron junk. In spite of warning, as this orgy did not subside, three more tear-gas shells were fired. As many people had gathered near the courts and canteens and as this continuous pelting of stones was likely to harm them and to save further destruction of property, the police had to get into the hostel and round up 11 persons. By about 4 P.M. the situation came under control.

In all 7 tear-gas shells were fired and 2 Sub-Inspectors and 16 police men received injuries. In these circumstances prohibitory orders under Section 35 of the Police Act was promulgated in a radius of one mile round the University Campus.

On 9-9-1969 Sri Gangaraj was examined by a Doctor and as advised, he was removed to the hospital.

Thus it will be appreciated that the police, in spite of provocation throughout had acted with utmost restraint and had perforce to use the minimum force in the interest of law and order. In the circumstances, I have issued a public appeal to Sri Gangaraj and to his colleagues on the Action Committee of the Students Council to call off their strike including the hunger strike, which benefits none but anti-social elements in society. I can only hope that this appeal will not go in vain.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ. – ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ನನ್ನ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯುಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ)

ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ತಾವು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಚನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೂ ಇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದು ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ ಎಕ್ಸೆಸ್‌ಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ನರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The Chair would like to know the consensus of the House on the subject as to whether such an adjournment motion could be allowed and whether an adjournment motion of this nature has been allowed previously.

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—There are precedents where such motions of this nature are allowed. It is a matter of public importance which has occurred very recently. Under such circumstances this may be allowed. The special circumstances of this nature warrant the attention of the House. If the motion is allowed, we can discuss and come to know what has happened there. I humbly request the Chair to agree to this motion.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—These are matters relating to administration and cannot form part of the subject matter of adjournment motion. Therefore the Chair rules it out of order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಸದನದ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾದಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕ ಇಂತಹ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಯೋಗಕ್ಷೇಮ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭ್ಯುದಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ದಾರಿತಪ್ಪಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಹೋಗರಾಡಿಸಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಲಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಚನೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಹತ್ತಾರು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಈ ಒಂದು ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಗಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ನಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ತಾವು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ರೂಲ್ 58ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲರವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದರ ಅಧ್ಯತೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯೇ ಬೇರೆ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲರವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯೇ ಬೇರೆ. ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಅಥಾರಿಟಿ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ನಾನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಹುಡುಗರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಎಲ್ಲೆಮೀರಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆಯೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ತಾವು Discussion on matters of Public importance of short duration item (2) ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಸೂಚಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಉಳಿದವರು ಇತರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿನ್ನೆ ನಡೆದಂತ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಸಹ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಎರಡಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಾವು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಹಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹೆಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಈ ಸಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಎಂದು ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ. 4—5 ದಿವಸದ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಕೂಡದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

5-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ನಾವು ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮೇರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿನ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಚ್. ಶಿವಾನಂದಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಎರಡೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾವು ತಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈಚಿನ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗಳೇನಿವೆ, ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಅದು ಕೊನೆಯ ಹಂತ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಈಚಿನ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಸಭಾಪತಿಯಾದವರು ಒಂದು ಸಲ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್‌ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕುದು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಹಕಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ವಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟು ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೂಡ ಉಚಿತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಹಕರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೋರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸಿ ನಾವು ಸಭಾತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

(*Members of the opposition withdrew from the House*).

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—I lay:

(*a*) The Annual Financial Statement of the Mysore State Electricity Board for the year 1969-70 (Volume II); under Section 61 of the Mysore Electricity (Supply) Act, 1949.

(*b*) The Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls (Mysore) Amendment Rules, 1969;

Notification No. GSR 275, dated 25th July 1969;
Under sub-section 4 of Section 23 of the Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act, 1956.

(*c*) The Registration of Hindu Marriages (Mysore) (Amendment) Rules, 1969;
Notification No. GSR 266, dated 10th July 1969 under Section 8(3) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—On behalf of the Minister for Transport, I lay:

The Mysore Motor Vehicles (XI Amendment) Rules, 1969;
Notification No. GSR 281, dated 15th July 1969;
Under section 133 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.
The Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation (IV Amendment) Rules, 1969;
Notification No. GSR 252, dated 8th July 1969;
Under Section 22 (4) of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957.

I beg to lay:

The Mysore Excise (spirituous preparations, manufacture, sales and accounts) Rules, 1969;
Notification No. GSR 217 dated 5th June 1969;
Under Section 71 (4) of the Mysore Excise Act, 1965.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs).—I beg to lay:

The Mysore Legislature Secretariat (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 1959;
Notification No. GSR 262, dated 15th July 1969;
Under Article 187 (3) of the Constitution of India.

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA (Minister for Education).—I lay:

Notification No. S.O. 1528, dated 16th July 1969; regarding Transfer of Commerce examinations from the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board to the Control of the Director of Public Instruction in Mysore, Bangalore;
Under Section 39 (2) of the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Act, 1966.

Sri P. M. NADGOUDA (Minister for Development).—I lay :

(*a*) The Mysore Warehouses Rules, 1969 ;

Notification No. GSR 241, dated 26th June 1969.; under Section 34 (3) of the Mysore Warehouse Act, 1961.

(*b*) The Mysore Panchayats Control of Erection of Buildings (Amendment) Rules, 1969 ;

Notification No. GSR 273, dated 15th July 1969; under Section 246 of the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards Act, 1959.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—On behalf of Minister for Health, I lay :

Mysore Corneal Grafting Rules, 1965.
Notification No. GSR 291, dated 8th August 1969 ;
under Section 7 (2) of the Mysore Corneal Grafting Act, 1965.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—On behalf of the Minister for Revenue, I lay :

(i) Notification No. S. O. 1374, dated 26th June 1969 ; regarding suspension of land revenue for the year 1963-64 in certain villages of Kundgol Taluk, Dharwar District ;

(ii) Notification No. S. O. 1373, dated 26th June 1969 regarding suspension of land revenue for the year 1962-63 in certain villages of Kundgol Taluk, Dharwar District ;

(iii) Notification No. REVSR 8658, dated 17th June 1969 ; regarding suspension of land revenue for the Revenue years 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69 in certain villages of Nargund Taluk, Dharwar District ;

(iv) Notification No. RD/LL Rsr. 1474, dated 21st April 1969 ; regarding suspension of land revenue for the Revenue year 1968-69 in certain villages of Gokak and Ramdurg Taluks, Belgaum District ;

(v) Notification No. REVSR 8661, dated 4th June 1969; regarding suspension of land revenue for the Revenue years 1966-67, 67-68 and 68-69 in certain villages of Hubli Taluk, Dharwar District ;

(vi) Notification No. REVER/8663, dated 4th June 1969 ; suspension of Land Revenue for the Revenue years 1966-67, 67-68 and 68-69 in certain villages of Gadag Taluk, Dharwar District ;

(vii) Notification No. REVSR/8584, dated 28th March 1969 ; Suspension of Land Revenue for the Revenue year 1968-69 in certain villages of Hangal and Gokak Taluks of Dharwar and Belgaum Districts respectively ;

(viii) Notification No. A2 CAL 24 C3331 68-69, dated 21st May 1969; regarding suspension of land reveune for the year 1968-69 in certain villages of Chickmagalur, Tarikere and Kadur Taluks ;

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

(ix) Notification No. REVSR 8661, dated 4th June 1969; regarding suspension of land revenue for the years 1966-67, 67-68 and 68-69 in certain villages of Mundargi Taluk, Dharwar District.

(x) Notification No. REVSR 8664, dated 4th June 1969 regarding suspension of Land Revenue for the years 1965-66, 66-67, 67-68 and 68-69 in certain villages of Haveri, Navalgund and Dharwar taluks;

(xi) Notification No. S. O. 1539, dated 11th July 1969; regarding remission of land revenue for the year 1967-68 in three taluks of Coorg District;

(xii) Notification No. S. O. 1668, dated 5th August 1969; regarding remission of land Revenue for the year 1967-68 in certain villages of Nargund Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xiii) Notification No. S. O. 1628, dated 26th July 1969; Remission of Land Revenue for the year 1968-69 in certain villages of Belgaum District;

(xiv) Notification No. S. O. 1716, dated 6th August 1969; Remission of land Revenue for the year 1968-69 in certain villages of Kumta Taluk, North Kanara District;

(xv) Notification No S. O. 1663, dated 28th July 1969; remission of land Revenue for the year 63-64 in certain villages of Hubli Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xvi) Notification No. S. O. 1664, dated 28th July 1969; remission of land revenue for the year 62-63 in certain villages of Hubli Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xvii) Notification No. S. O. 1665, dated 28th July 1969; remission of land revenue for the year 1962-64 in certain villages of Hubli Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xviii) Notification No. S.O. 1666, dated 2nd August 1969; Remission of land revenue for the year 1962-63 in certain villages of Hubli Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xix) Notification No. S.O. 1646, dated 29th July 1969; Remission of land revenue for the year 1962-63 in Navalgund Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xx) Notification No. S.O. 1647, dated 29th July 1969; Remission of land Revenue for the year, 62-63 in Navalgund Taluk, Dharwar District;

(xxi) Notification No. S.O. 1608, dated 24th July 1969; Remission of land Revenue in certain villages of Dharwar Taluk;

under Section 194(2) of the Mysore Land Revenue Act, 1964.

(*b*) Notification No. S.O. 628 dated 5th March 1969; regarding Exemption of Survey No. 69 of City Hubli, Dharwar Taluk from the provisions of Sections 80 and 81A of the Act;

under section 140 of the Mysore Land Reforms Act, 1961.

(*c*) (i) Order No. RD 47 EST 69, dated 13th August 1969.

(ii) Order No. RD 60 EST 69, dated 2 st August 1969; regarding Remission of Stamp duties chargeable under the Act;

under Section 9 (2) of the Mysore Stamp Act, 1957.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—On behalf of the Minister of State for Forests, I lay:

The Mysore Forest Rules, 1969:

under Section 103 of the Mysore Forest Act, 1963.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The notifications, etc., are laid on the Table.

SECRETARY.—As required under Rule 100 of the Rules of Procedure, I beg to lay on the Table of the House:

The Mysore Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) (amendment) Bill, 1969, as passed by the Legislative Assembly.

Second Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation

Presentation

Smt. ABBASIA BEGUM MECCI.—I beg to present:

The Second Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The Second Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation is presented.

Discussion on a Matter of Urgent Public Importance *re*: affairs of the Bangalore University.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—I would like to know from the Hon. Leader of the House whether we shall take up the second item *viz*, discussion on the affairs of the Bangalore University, first?

† Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA (Minister for Education).—Sir, I would very much appreciate if the business is taken up in the order in which it is put in the List of Business and circulated. But if the Chair

(SRI K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA)

is of the opinion that the second item for discussion should be taken up first and the first item should be taken up afterwards, I have no objection. while speaking on the University affairs, as far as possible, reference to the internal administration of the University, may be avoided.

Sri A. K. SUBBAIAH.—I protest against the condition imposed by the hon. Leader of the House. We are responsible Members of the House and we know how to speak. We are participating in the business of the House from along time and we know what should be referred to and what should not be referred to.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—As Leader of the House, the Hon. Minister has some responsibility in the conduct of business. I have already stated that while discussions take place, everything should conform to the Rules of Procedure. I will watch the discussions and regulate it.

† Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.— I beg to raise a discussion.

On the affairs of the Bangalore University arising out of the statement made by the Hon. Minister for Education in the Legislative Council on 27th August 1969 with a view to clarify the differing points on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, when I stated that there are differing view-points on the subject, which has agitated both the student community and the Bangalore University, I wanted to point out that these affairs of the University, are not bilateral. It is not necessarily between the students and the University authorities. First of all, I would like to make it very clear and specific that the University funds are made up of the Consolidated Funds of the State. The Government cannot, by any stretch of imagination, absolve its responsibility if there were to be certain miscanceptions, or right conceptions as the case may be, as far as the University is concerned. It has to be taken into consideration not only by the Government but also by the University and also the student bodies. This is not a matter which we can discuss taking up positions or thinking of prestige. The University, as is well known, is a repository of learning and thinking. Best thoughts and best ideas have emanated from universities all over the world ever since the concept of education came into being. Nobody, be he a politician, or administrator or a member of the public, should consider this from a preconceived notion or question of prestige. With this preamble I would like to mention that the material at the disposal of the representatives of the legislature of this State are not exhaustive enough as to understand the mind of the Government or the minds of the students or the minds of the university authorities. The statement given by the Hon. Minister on 28-8-1969 is very brief. It does not touch even the fringe of the problems involved which have come to our knowledge. Even the

statement made just now by the Hon. Chief Minister commenced from the incidents started from 14-8-1969 when the student leaders presented a memorandum to the Government making their demands. But what little material we have before us, goes much beyond that. There is one printed weekly by the name "RETORT" it was published early in August 1969 and as far as the history of the strike goes, it reads like this:

> "Almost a fortnight prior to the actual strike, pamphlets proclaiming the irregularities in the varsity administration were distributed near the Varsitv office. This caused a great stir and an emergent meeting of the Syndicate was held which categorically denied all the charges. This move by the Syndicate was answered by a strike call. The Vice-Chancellor appealed to the students not to abstain from classes. A few heeded to this advice. Most of the students gave their support to the strike call by joining the procession to the university office. All roads led to the Central College. The students who poured in demanded "expel the Registrar—give T.C. to the V.C.-Down with the Registrar" and took placards with similar slogans. The Press report estimates the number of students to a staggering figure of 12,000. From there the crowd proceeded to the Vidhana Soudha."

This means to say that as on 14-8-1969, from which date the Chief Minister was pleased to give the history *i.e.*, on the day the students had already taken up positions, the university also had taken up a position which compelled the students to strike. When the students resorted to strike there was no violence. That was the report by the press and the public. When the students struck work on that particular day and presented their demands to the Chief Minister, the movement was calm, there was no violence. Observing non-violence the students came to the Government and presented their demands by way of a Memorandum to the highest authority. We know today that the Chief Minister gave reply to that memorandum on 1-9-1969 stating that the Government will consider and that it is an internal matter, etc. So, the Government has taken 17 long days to reply to the memorandum presented by the student leaders. In the meanwhile, and even before the students presented the memorandum what had happened is briefly indicated in this paper, "Retort." Now, when it is a question of learning by millions of students in the university and when it is a matter of life and death to the thousands of students attendi g the university, and their future life till their death is involved should we stand on the legalities of the University Act, or the legalities of the right or otherwise of the Government to interfere with the university authorites? Or have we any responsibilty to look into these matters dispassionately without taking up any positions of prestige? This is what I would like to place before the House. I am not going to come to any conclusion or pass remarks. I am just giving facts. I do not want to give opinions.

(SRI D. RAJAGOPAL)

Can we stand quiet when the highest repository of earning and thinking is disturbed, whatever may be the reasons or, legalities involved or whatever may be the relationship between the university and the Government. That is the question. Is it not the responsibility of each and every one of us including the Government and the university authorities to see that they takle the problem immediately and find a solution so that the students morale is not affected and the students lives are not endangered? This as we all known was a subject matter of 2 hours discussion. It has really endangered the lives of the students and it also endangered the life of the Minister concerned and it endangers the lives of the public and it also affects public propertis causing loss to the State. Can we sit in complacence when such grave issues face the State? There are some preconceived motions about this. Some people say it is the sectarian attitude of the students that has been responsible for this situation; some people say it is political manouevering by some group of politicians that has been responsible; some people say it is communal feelings of the people that has been responsible. Should we go by these slogans and should the Government which has the entire responsibility allow things to drift and create a situation which will endanger lives and result in destruction of property?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎ. ಶಂಕರಗೌಡ.—14ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಬಂದಾಗ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟು ಮೇಲೂ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್‌ರವರಿಂದ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಈ ತಿಂಗಳ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಮಗೂ ಯುನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡದೇ ಕುಳಿತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಅಲಗೇಷನ್‌ನ್ನೂ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಿಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ, ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಸಿ ಕೇಸು ರುಜುವಾತು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜ್ಯುಡಿಷಿಯರ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉತ್ತರ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯುನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನಿಂದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅನ್ನುವ ವರೆಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು?

SRI D. RAJAGOPAL.—I am not disputing any of the points mentioned by the Hon'ble Minister, but I am narrating the sequence of events as they have developed. Are we to condemn the students for putting up slogans? What are we doing as Government? Are we not putting up slogans at each and every point? Should we go by slogans in this matter? Are we bestowing to this the minimum and urgent attention that is needed when every day's drift is resulting in the endangerment of the lives of innocent students and also in the destruction of public property? Are we to go by prestige in this issue? I am not disputing what the Government has done or not done; I am also not passing remarks against anybody. Before the students came on 14th August 1969 to the Hon'ble the Chief Minister to present their memorandum, how did this voluminous cyclostyled copy get out of the University? Have the University authorities acted with restraint and responsibility? Let us concede for a moment that the students are

careless, callous or indifferent or mischievous in bringing out this pamphlet containing 19 allegations against the University. But how did the University come out with a reply immediately ? Is it difficult for the Government to get at this and know whether it is true or not.

The first point I want to make is, particularly when the student community is concerned, it is the responsibility of the Government to intervene and settle the issue ; they should consider all the points immediately and not allow things to drift endangering the lives of students and resulting in the destruction of public property.

If we go through the notice issued by the President of the Bangalore University Students Council, dated 27th July 1969, it is clear that the simmerings of this discontent and agitation were felt as early as 9th July 1969 by the Vice-Chancellor. He sent for the President of the Bangalore University Students Council and took a note from him saying that the original notice might have been issued by some other people and was not authorised by Sri Gangaraj. So, this is not a recent matter it was agitating the minds of the authorities much earlier than 9th July. As early as 9th July when it came to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor and the University Authorities, what were they doing except sending for the President of the Students Council and asking him to disown it. Is that the way a responsible Vice-Chancellor should behave ?

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Let their be no reference to the Vice-Chancellor.

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—Is it the intention of the Chair that we should not mention even the word Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, etc. ? Then we need not discuss at all. How can we proceed then ?

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—It is not proper on the part of the hon. Member to question the intention of the Chair.

5-30 P. M.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—Here there is a reference to the Vice-Chancellor and a statement is also there. That is why I am mentioning the facts as they have been placed before us. I am not going on anything imaginary. The Hon. Minister was pleased to state that the students were told on 14th August 1969 that they would be given a reply before the end of August. I quite agree with him, but I would ask, had the public known about it. We were in the dark. The students and the public and everyone were in the dark in such a very delicate matter of urgent public importance. All this happened on 9th July 1969. Any responsible head of a university should have taken cognizance of this simmering discontent instead of calling the student leader and asking him to disown it. He could have had hundreds of opportunities and he could have had hundred and one ways of dealing with the situation arising like this. We need not teach the Vice-Chancellor what are the ways in which he should deal with it. But still prudence and commonsense dictates that when such a discontent arose he should have adopted all the

(SRI D. RAJAGOPAL)

powers at his command to erase that discontent. The incident took place on 9th July 1969. On the other hand the Vice-Chancellor sent for the Council President and asked him to disown the pomphlet issued earlier in his name. This is the least that is expected of a responsible person holding such a high office in the university.

Then on 27th July, the Council Action President disowning the previous pamphlet issued on 9th July issued a printed pamphlet addressed to His Excellency the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Minister, the Vigilance Commission and all hon. Members of the Legislature and the citizens of Bangalore. He has owned it also subsequently. What should be the action to be taken by the university authorities when such an allegation was made? It is against the Vice-Chancellor; it is against the Registrar. I quite agree. What should be the attitude of the Vice-Chancellor of the Bangalore University when such grave allegations were made and demands were made for judicial enquiry into them? We have no official information on what the Vice-Chancellor did or the university authorities did when this pamphelt was published, but we have before us an 18-page cyclostyled document issued by the university authorities. This bears no insignia; this bears no signature; this bears no date, but everybody on earth knows that it is issued by the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar of the Bangalore University. The members of the Senate and the Syndicate agree that it has been issued by the university authorities. Before going into each and every aspect of it, this university which is considered sacred and most learned uses words likes "it is impudent on the part of any one to make a charge". Is this the wording to be used by the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar of a university while referring to agitated minds? Even the agitation may be incorrect. I agree that the agitation may be frivolous, may be sectional and may be communal. I quite agree with all that. When the university issues an authoritative statement.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Unless it is issued under the authority of the university it cannot be said to be authoritative.

SRI D. RAJAGOPAL.—There are members of the University Senate here. Let them say that it was not issued by the university; let Government say that it was not issued by the university. Then I shall not talk a word about it.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ತಾವಾಗಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಆ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆನೆಟ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ತಾರೀಖನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥವರೇ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್.—ಆಡಳಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಭವವಿದೆ. ತಾವು ನನಗೇನೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಾರದು. ಈ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಂಚಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಲಿ.

Sri C. S. BALAKRISHNA GOWDA.—Sir, there is a statement which has been definitely issued either by the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor or by both. Here, there are one or two members of the Syndicate and the Senate. Let them say that it is not the statement issued by the University authorities.

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA.—Let us not make much of it.

Sri C. S. BALAKRISHNA GOWDA.—If that is so, we assume that it has been issued by the University authorities.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—Is this the language that we have to teach the students? They say that considerations other than....." are entirely false and frivolous." Still stronger words are used by the University authorities for refuting the allegations and charges made. Can anybody approve of such a language being used in such a document, particularly when the students are involved in it? Can we provoke students by using that language? In fact, that is what has happened. It is this document which was hurriedly prepared as I have already stated—I want to repeat it again—and rushed to the press, that has been responsible for the strike, for all the agitations and ills that have developed in the University ever since disruption started.

Now, we have known the position taken up by the students, we know the stage at which the University entered into the field. Until then, the Government was ignorant, until 14th August 1969. As per the literature and the facts available to us, the Government was kept completely in the dark from 1st July to 14th August 1969.

The argument that may be advanced is that the students have only to learn these lessons; and that they should not interfere with the administration of the University. The students slogan is 'Down with Registrar, Down with the Vice-Chancellor'. The slogans from the other side is 'students have no right to interfere with the University administration'. I quite agree; I do not deny. Suppose I am the student, and I fail to get good education and learing in the University. If I am not given proper training, have I no authority to interfere with the University? Should I accept whatever you throw at me and be contented? If I am a student, my parents pay for the University administration, and I also pay to the University for receiving education. If I am not given the right type of education and if I have such a feeling, should I not express it? Is that what the University wants to tell the students? Is it that what they have said is the right things to be told to the students who are in an agitated mind however wrong they may be? The question has been argued from all sorts of angles and from all sides I do not mean to say only from one side. The four page printed pamphlet issued by Sri Gangaraj contains 19 allegations with prefixes and suffixes. Immediately on the issue of the pamphlet the students were dubbed as communalists. Politics were brought into it. It was stated that politicians had a hand in instigating the students. The University came out with this Booklet, using a language which is not

(SRI D. RAJAGOPAL)

worthy of a University. But, did anybody think about it in the right direction at that time? They have made an allegation, whether they have the right or not. But as responsible men, as legislators and as members of the Cabinet we should not look at it from the angle whether it is right or not. What they should do is that they should immediately sit together and see if there is any truth in it or not. If there is no truth, should not the students be told that there is no truth what they have stated and should they not be asked, to give more details if they want to substantiate the allegations? I quite understand the position of the Government in this matter, because they were ignorant of the whole thing till 14th August 196'. It was the responsibility of the University authorities Vice-Chancellor, Syndicate or Senate to have taken immediate note of this, sat together in Conference, discussed it without agitated tempers or preconceived notions and tried to find out a solution to end this agitation. That was not done. On the other hand a reply was hurriedly prepared and distributed and sent to the Press That provoked the students to go on strike and then march to the Vidhana Soudha, and now it has resulted in shooting, firing, destruction of property, loss of life and danger to life and fear among the students. I would like, without going in detail, to take the allegations one by one and note the facts only I am not going to make a comment.

The first allegation is that there is communal domination in the University and that consideration of merit is totally absent in the matter of recruitment of staff in the university and so on and so forth. When I read this, I myself feel that it is a rabid statement. But, I would like to point out what the University has said about it. Then they have given what does Rule 28 say, then the procedure laid down for appointments, etc. It is unfair and unjust to question the motives of the experts on the powers of appointment. They are eminents acadamicians from other Universities.

SRI G. V. ANJANAPPA.—Section 28 deals with only teaching staff. Non-teaching staff is appointed by the officers of the University.

SRI D. RAJAGOPAL.—Sir, I would like to know, whether this is the way the University authorities should reply? They could have simply stated 'what students have stated is not true'. Instead of that, they have gone to the extent of saying that the students cannot question the motives of the eminent academic men in the Syndicate who deal with the matter of appointments, etc. The students have further alleged that the principle is that recruitment of teaching staff should always be on merit and it is a general principle. So, I would like to know why the University tried to reply in this manner? Has not this provoked the students further?

Then Sir, the second allegation made by the students is that the Syndicate functions only as a political wing of the communal faction or

the majority of avowed politicians and not educationists. I quite agree, Sir, that this sort of a statement on the very face of it, appears to be very rabid.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಇದು ಕುಂಬಳಕಾಯಿ ಕಳ್ಳ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೆಗಲು ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡು ಎನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಯ್ತು.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಗೌರವವಾದ ಪದವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸ ಬಾರದು. ಅದು ಘನತೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲರವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆಂದರೆ, ಅವನ್ನು ನೋಡು ವಾಗ ರೆ ಇಟ್ ಈಸ್ ಎ ರ್ಯಾಬಿಡ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಉಪಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.—ನಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಉನ್ನತ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ನ್ಯೂಡೆಂಟ್ಸ್ 19 ಅಲಗೇಶನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಒಂದು ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿ ಕೊಡಿ ಯಾವುದು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬಾರದು, ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಟಿ. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ತಾವು ಕುಂಬಳಕಾಯಿ ಕಳ್ಳ ಹೆಗಲು ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ನೋಡು ಎಂಬುದು ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಅಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನೀವು ಘನತೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ, ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಬದ್ಧರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪದ ಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ, ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಿರಿ, ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಗಾದೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ, ಅದು ಪಾರ್ಲ ಮೆಂಟರಿ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಂದೀಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲರವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೂ ಆರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂದರೆ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳ ಅಂಶ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ಹುಚ್ಚು ಹುಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೂ ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri D. RAJGOPAL.—This is a matter of great importance and it has taken a very grave turn. I only said that the first and the second allegations made by the students, on the very face of it, appear to be most rabid on the part of the students. I have not said anything against the Syndicate members. If the Chair feels that anything is wrong, I am prepared to subject myself to scrutiny.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—It will be verified from the records.

6-00 P.M.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—I have not stated any other thing. I have stated that action may be taken to set right things according to the first allegation of the students of the University. Is it expected of the University to use the language of the students? The students are to learn from the University, but not *vice versa*.

(SRI D. RAJAGOPAL)

The next allegation is with regard to the functions of the Syndicate. The allegation says that there is a political wing of the communal faction. On the face of it, it looks as though it is true. But the reply of the University is not in any way better. According to the provisions of the Act, 3 members are to elected from the Senate and 2 members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor. This is how the Syndicate should be constituted. It is alleged that the majority of the members are avowed politicians and not educationists. Are the students wrong if they say that the two members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor are avowed politicians? It is not wrong on the part of the students to say that the constitution of the Syndicate is not correct. The students may be irresponsible. But they are still human beings and they have common sense. Can the University authority use this language? The whole thing as the students say, may not be true. But the behaviour of the authorities is rather surprising. There is some truth in what they have stated. When they say that two members are avowed politicians, have you challenged that? I will mention their names, if the Hon'ble members want to know them.

Now we shall go to the next allegation. It is about the appointment of a Geology Professor. They say this has been done on extraneous consideration and not on merit. This is what we fail to understand. What they have stated, as I understand, is that the professor is not appointed on merits. He has a shady past. The past history is not very acceptable. Let us hear the reply of the University. It is a very interesting thing that they say about this man. What they have stated is that "Sri Rampure has passed intermediate I Class I rank" "They go one step further and say "he has passed Ph.D. of Madras University in 1951". The next qualification that is given is that "he was a Post Doctoral Fellow of the California University during 1951-52". Is that the qualification prescribed for a Professor? This is the academic qualification mentioned. They have not mentioned any experience. If they had mentioned the experience of that person, he could have been easily classified. Fellow means a student. I have also studied in foreign Universities and I have visited foreign countries and foreign Universities during 1951-53. I was in the United States during that period. I know what Post Doctoral Fellow is. Further "he has served in Venkateshwara University and he was the Principal of that College during 1963-65. During 1965-66 he was the visiting Professor and Research Scientist in the University of California, U.S.A. The semesteral terms of the University is six months. He was a visiting Professor for six months. I do not dispute it. But are these qualifications enough for appointment of a Professor?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Hon. Member may Comment on the statement made by the Hon. Chief Minister. But he need not go into details.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—I am doing nothing but that. He was a Visiting Professor and Research Scientist in the University of California. I want to know what he had done in 2 semesters. We can brush aside the allegations if he had really the required qualifications at his credit, but they have given such flimsy and smoky facts. I am not satisfied with what they have given. That is why I am commenting upon this. What they have given about this man gives room for doubt.

Am I not right in asking for an enquiry about it? I am not going by any other statement, but the statement furnished by the University. On the face of it, the University has tried to influence in favour of the candidates whom it has appointed. It makes me smell rats and fleas. Added to these things, is this last para with reference to the student delegation, why did the Bangalore University not know his suspicious past? The reply of the University is: "Dr. Pampapathi Rao had his differences with Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi. It was verified at the time of interview that Dr. Rao was free from blame in any of the matters in which he had difference with the University." They accept that this Dr. Pampapathi Rao had differences with the University of Tirupathi where he is said to have served for 15 years. What business had the University to decide that those differences had nothing to do with his job here and that he was free from blame and then to appoint him? If it was not within the knowledge of the University when he was appointed, I can understand that even when it was within the knowledge of the University, this is the reply that they give:

> "Dr. Pampapathi Rao had differences with Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi. It was verified at the time of interview and it was understood that Dr. Rao was free from blame in any of the matters in which he had differences with the University."

what material these people had to come to this decision?

Sri V. S. HIRE GOWDAR.—I am on a point of order. May I draw the attention of the Chair to Rule 57 which says that every speech on a motion under Rule 57 should not exceed fifteen minutes and the mover of the motion may take not more than half an hour? I request the Chair to fix a time limit for the mover and spare time for the other Members to participate in the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The rule contemplates a brief statement by the mover.

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—On previous occasions of this nature, when speeches were made for half-an-hour and one hour, hon. Members did not raise any objection, nor was any time-limit was fixed. Now he is not entitled to raise a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—Rule 60 says that there shall be no formal motion before the Council, nor voting. The member who has given notice, may make a short statement and the Minister shall reply shortly.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—I have given this motion and I have clearly stated that this is under Rule 58. Rule 58 does not contemplate any of these things.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The hon. Member may continue. So far as time is concerned, the Chair is watching.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—I must make one observation. When we are trying to discuss a point dispassionately and objectively, and when it is really necessary to save a situation or analyse a situation and take a decision in the matter, I do not know why some friends like my Hon'ble friend Sri Hire Gowdar should worry himself about the time. Rather he should worry about the lives of students, the fear of parents, and the danger to public life and property. I am sorry he is worried about a small Rule. It is really such people that are really a danger to society and danger to the nation.

Smt. M. R. LAKSHAMMA.—We are listening to Sri Rajagopal with very great patience. I only hope that he will not dub one of our Members as danger to society!

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—I am sorry I withdraw that phrase if it has hurt anybody in this House. I was only appealing to him to understand the gravity of the situation and the consequences of the situation. We may be sitting in this Council scot-free. People going about in the streets are being hit by stones, by laties and by bullets. That situation we have to take into consideration. We are discussing here not for nothing.

Well, Sir, as I said, looking to the students allegation and the reply here, really, no man with some conscience and responsibility can expect a statement from the University which says :

> " it was verified at the time of interview and it was known that Dr. Rao was free from blame in any of the matters in which he had differences with the University "

What right has the Bangalore University to sit in judgment over the affairs of the Venkateswara University ? Was it right in provoking the students in this manner, I would like to know.

Now we are coming to the fourth allegation. It reads like this :

> "What can be the integrity of this University, when it appoints one Dr. Naganna as Head of the Department in Geology, and yet supersedes him by another person creating a dual officialdom ? Does this not prove two organs function in this University, one a voiceless, dedicated, service-minded group and the other to perpetuate communalism ? It is a chain in all other departments too."

On the face of this, there appears a very hasty and vehement statement by the University Officers. On page 4, while replying to allegation No. 4, they have stated that Dr. Naganna is a highly qualified

person and has been appointed as Reader in the Geology Department and also as Head of the Department, whereas Government, before the College was handed over to the University, had appointed Sri M. Suryanarayana Sastry, M.Sc. as Reader and Head of the Department. By reading all these 3½ pages, I have still got doubt whether Dr. Naganna is Head of the Department as Reader or whether Sri M. Suryanarayana Sastry is the Head of the Department as Reader. In the reply nothing has been shown. One important point we have to read here. When the College was under the Government, the seniormost Lecturer in the College had been promoted as Reader without reference to his research activity and publications...Sri M. Suryanarayana Sastry, who had been thus promoted by Government was functioning as Head of the Department when the College was transferred to the Bangalore University. So, according to them, a man without reference to his research activity and publications, had been promoted by the Government and he is still being continued as Reader and Head of the Department...Now they go to the Board of Appointments.

> "The Board of Appointment interviewed the candidates who had applied in response to the advertisement and expressed the view that having regard to the background and the conditions prevailing in the Department, the person to be appointed as Professor and Head of the Department should, in addition to high academic distinctions and research output, possess good organising capacity and administrative abilities." I would underline :
>
> "In addition to high academic distinctions and research out put, possess good organising capacity and administrative abilities."

My humble request to the House is to keep these words in view. So when any appointment of a Professor is considered, "in addition to high academic distinctions and research output", the candidate should have good organising capacity and administrative abilities. The University authorities proceeding further say :

> "Taking all aspects of the situation into consideration, the Board recommended that the post of Professor might be held in abeyance for about a year and only a Reader appointed or in the alternative, a person of outstanding merit be invited....."
>
> "Pursuant to this recommendation, Dr. West of Saugar University was invited but he declined the offer.
>
> "The Board recommended that Dr. C. Naganna be appointed as Reader and Head of the Department against the post of Professor as he was the best amongst the candidates interviewed."

(SRI D. RAJAGOPAL)

So they appointed Dr. Naganna as Reader but not as professor although they have stated :

> "Dr. Naganna is B.Sc. (Hons.)–I Class, Mysore University, (1952);
>
> M.Sc. I Class (1956), Madras University ; D.Sc. Charles University, Prague (1962), the highest degree awarded by that University in Geology."

The Board of Appointment have considered him as the only available candidate with the best qualifications and the highest acdamic distinctions and the highest experience. He is in the University from 1952 till to-day for 17 years and even to-day he is a Reader and he is appointed as a Reader against the post of Professor although he was the best amongst the candidates interviewed having the best qualification and experience. I have no grouse against that. But further down you please read :

> "He was invited to the XXIII Session of the International Geological Congress held in Prague in August 1968. He was to present a paper at this Session and preside over one of its Sectional meetings, but could not proceed to attend the Session due to the political developments in Czechoslovakia at that time. More recently. Dr. Naganna is one of the 30 Scientists invited from all over the world to the Earth Science Curriculum Project Leadership Conference being held in the University of Maryland, U.S.A. from 3rd to 16th August 1969. He is the only Scientist from India to have this distinct honour."

This Dr. Naganna, with all the high qulifications, is not considered suitable for the post of Professor, whereas Dr. Pampathi Rao, having lesser qualifications and lesser experience than Dr. Naganna, is considered most suitable with his shady background in Thirupathi University and appointed as Professor. They may be right ; I am not condemning them. What do we feel when we read these things ? Do we not smell rates and fleas ? When the University students come across such grievous considerations in the University, how will they feel about it ? Are they not right in using this rabid language ?

SRI K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA.—The Board of Appointments will consider the opinion of the experts. What the experts say, the University will have to accept. If there is any deviation from the opinion of the experts, then the University can be questioned. Here there is no deviation. They have acted according to the opinion of the experts.

SRI D. RAJAGOPAL.—That is what the University wants us to read right from the first page. They have quoted the scriptures, and the Bible but are they sticking to the Bible, is the question that we

have to exmamine. How can any University authority or the Vice-Chancellor of the University allow such contradictions to come under the very nose of the person, whatever be his authority ? The expert is not the final authority on this matter. The Vice-Chancellor has every right to tell the Syndicate what they have done is wrong or right, based upon the contradictions at least. I do not want to go into details. When Dr. Pampapathi Rao can be considered an expert why not Dr. Naganna having better qualifications and experience ?

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA.—In the case of Dr. Pampapath-Rao, he had number of Publications to his credit. While Dr. Pampapathi Rao had nearly 50 publications to his credit, in the case of Dr. Naganna he has not so many publications to his credit.

Sri D. RAJAGOPAL.—Are Publications the only criteria ? Can we test that by the other appointment made ? I am prepared to accept the explanation. When Dr. Naganna has been included among the 30 world scientists who have distinguished themselves in the particular branch of science, can you condemn him ? Where are the figures to show that Dr. Naganna has not published papers to the same extent as Dr. Pampapathi Rao has at one ?

Sri G. V. ANJANAPPA.—There was another applicant. He was a Professor who had appointed many Professors all over India and who had trained and guided several Ph.Ds. Even that applicant, who was already a Professor, was not considered suitable.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.—The House will now adjourn and re-assemble at 2. 30 P.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes Past Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 11th September 1969.

WD 13622—GPB—600—6-7-1970